



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,155	02/25/2004	Peter Schiller	7596/80982	8148

7590 04/01/2005

Michael A. Sanzo  
Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery  
Suite 401L  
1801 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-1201

EXAMINER

LUKTON, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1653

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/785,155

**Applicant(s)**

SCHILLER ET AL.

**Examiner**

David Lukton

**Art Unit**

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11, 12 and 15-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11, 12 and 15-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

70

Pursuant to the preliminary amendment, claims 5-10, 13, 14 have been cancelled, claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16 amended, and claims 17-18 added. Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 15-18 are pending.



Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,703,483. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The claimed genera are substantially the same. Claim 1 of the instant application recites "pharmacologically acceptable salts", but otherwise the claims are the same.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).



The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have asserted that the claimed compounds will bind to one of the opioid receptors, and that they exhibit analgesic activity. Although specific experiments have been proposed, no particular activity of any claimed compound has been identified. Thus, it is entirely possible that all compounds are inactive, and therefore not useful. One cannot determine activity merely by viewing a structure. Even the expenditure of "undue experimentation" provides no assurance of success.

As stated in *Ex parte Forman* (230 USPQ 546, 1986) and *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400, Fed. Cir., 1988) the factors to consider in evaluating the need (or absence of need) for "undue experimentation" are the following: quantity of experimentation necessary, amount of direction or guidance presented, presence or absence of working examples, nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in that art, predictability or unpredictability of the art, and breadth of the claims. It is asserted that where receptor binding, receptor antagonism, and receptor activation are concerned, structure activity relationships are unpredictable, and moreover, one cannot predict receptor activation on the basis of receptor binding. Consider the following:

- Combarous (*Endocrine Reviews* 13, 670, 1992) discloses that receptors are specific with regard to the compounds that they will recognize, and the reference provides examples of structural modifications which resulted in elimination of activity.
- Torsello, Antonio (*Endocrinology* 143 (5) 1968, 2002) pertains to growth hormone, but discloses that stimulation of the growth hormone secretagogue receptor does not correlate with capability to stimulate GH secretion.

- McFadyen "Modifications of the cyclic mu receptor selective tetrapeptide Tyr-c[D-Cys-Phe-D-Pen]NH<sub>2</sub>(Et): effects on opioid receptor binding and activation" (*Journal of Peptide Research* **55** (3) 255-61, 2000) reported on modifications to the title peptide. The reference discloses that potency changes did not always correlate with affinity, suggesting that the conformation required for binding and the conformation required for activation of the opioid receptors are different.
- Keith , "mu-Opioid receptor internalization: opiate drugs have differential effects on a conserved endocytic mechanism in vitro and in the mammalian brain" (*MOLECULAR PHARMACOLOGY*, (1998 Mar) 53 (3) 377-84) discloses that the different effects of individual agonists are not correlated with their potencies for receptor activation and that a variety of clinically important agonists differ significantly in their relative abilities to stimulate the rapid internalization of opioid receptors.
- Lunec, "MSH receptor expression and the relationship to melanogenesis and metastatic activity in B16 melanoma" (*Melanoma Research* (1992 May) 2 (1) 5-12) compared the effects of different pro-opiomelanocortin (POMC) peptides on melanogenesis and metastasis and their relationship to MSH receptor expression in B16F1 melanoma cells. The authors disclose that the relative binding affinities of the different peptides, measured by displacement of [125I]-Nle<sup>4</sup>DPhe<sup>7</sup>-alpha-MSH, did not closely correlate with the relative potencies in stimulating melanogenesis and metastasis. This suggests that receptor activation and the subsequent biological response is not determined solely by binding affinity.

Applicants may choose to argue that they have modified the structure of compounds that have been shown by others to exhibit a particular pharmacological effect. The first point is that, since structure/binding relationships are unpredictable, the structural modifications could very well have eliminated binding altogether. And even if the claimed compounds will bind to one of the opioid receptors, such binding does not correlate with receptor activation. Given that absence of guidance, the absence of working examples,

and the unpredictability of the art, the conclusion is that "undue experimentation" would be required to practice the claimed invention.



Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites (last line) the following:

"as well as pharmaceutically and pharmacologically acceptable salts thereof".

What is the difference, exactly, between a salt that is pharmaceutically acceptable, and a salt which is pharmacologically acceptable? It would be helpful if applicants would provide an example of a salt which is "pharmaceutically acceptable", but which is not, at the same time, "pharmacologically acceptable", and *vice versa*. This will then provide the basis for further discussion. Better still would simply be to delete the phrase "pharmacologically acceptable" from the claim.



No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber, can be reached at 571-272-0925. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.



DAVID LUKTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800